# REPORT RESUMES

ED 020 256 UD 005 737

SECOND ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TITLE I, FISCAL YEAR 1967.

BY- COSTA, EDWARD T. AND OTHERS
RHODE ISLAND STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE

PUB DATE DEC 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.20 78P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, SUMMER PROGRAMS, KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN, HIGHER EDUCATION, ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, TEST RESULTS, READING ACHIEVEMENT, LIBRARY PROGRAMS, SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS, ATTENDANCE, DROPOUT RATE, HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, REMEDIAL READING, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, ANNUAL REPORTS, INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION, SPECIAL EDUCATION, STATISTICAL DATA, ESEA TITLE 1

FOLLOWING THE FORMAT STIPULATED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, THIS REPORT DESCRIBES THE ACTIVITIES AND METHODS OF RHODE ISLAND'S 88 COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROJECTS. HIGHLIGHTED ARE FIVE PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND EXEMPLARY PROJECTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION, INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION, SUMMER KINDERGARTEN ACTIVITIES, AND SUMMER LIBRARY SERVICES. TABULAR DATA ON SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, DROPOUT RATES, STANDARDIZED TESTS RESULTS, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION ARE PRESENTED. TOTAL STATE EXPENDITURES ON ALL PROJECTS WAS $3,578,640, 57 PERCENT OF WHICH WAS SPENT ON READING AND RELATED ACTIVITIES. THE EXISTENCE OF NUMEROUS REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMS IN RHODE ISLAND HAS CREATED AN AWARENESS AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL OF THE NEED FOR ADVANCED COURSES AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN READING. (LB)

05237

ED020256

UD 005 237

# HAND TOUCHES HAND

## AS THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND REACHES OUT TO HELP ITS EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN

# STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

ROBERT F. PICKARD, Chairman

JOSEPH L. BYRON, Vice Chairman
RICHARD F. STAPLES

EDWIN C. BROWN
LOUIS DeANGELIS

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN
ARLINE R. KIVEN

Title Design by *Lura N. Sellew*

# ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

# TITLE I
IN
# RHODE ISLAND

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIO STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

## SECOND ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TITLE I: FISCAL YEAR 1967

by

EDWARD T. COSTA
Consultant on Compensatory Education

LENORE DELUCIA
Consultant on Evaluation

GORDON N. SUNDBERG
Supervisor, Compensatory Education

RICHARD A. ALLAIRE
Supervisor, Compensatory Education

UD 005 137

1636

WILLIAM P. ROBINSON, JR.
Commissioner of Education

ARTHUR R. PONTARELLI
Deputy Commissioner of Education

GRACE M. GLYNN
Associate Commissioner of Education

RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Providence, Rhode Island

December, 1967

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

Page

. PROLOGUE. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . i

Section I. MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

SECTION II DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS. . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

SEA Services to LEAs . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3
    Project Development. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
    Project Implementation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
    Project Evaluation.. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5
    Information Dissemination. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

Most Pressing Educational Needs. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 9

Most Prevalent Project Objectives. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .11
    Primary Objectives . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .11
    Secondary Objectives . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .11
    Most Effective Approaches to Reach Each Objective. . . . . . . . . .12
        To Improve Classroom Performance in Reading. . . . . . . . . . .12
        To Improve Classroom Performance in Other Skill Areas. . . . . .16
        To Help Upgrade and Improve the Childrens' Verbal Functioning. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .19
        To Upgrade the Cultural Level of the Educationally Deprived Child. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .21

Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs . . . . . . . . .23
    Title II . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .24
    Title III. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .24
    Title V. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .25
    The U.S.D.A. Food Program. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .25
    Community Action Agency. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .26
    Neighborhood Youth Corps . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .26
    Job Corps. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .26
    Welfare Administration Program . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .26
    Medical Aid to Indigent Families . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .27

Staff Development and Utilization. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .27
    Development and Improvement of SEA Staff Utilization . . . . . . . .27
    Development and Improvement of LEA Staff Utilization . . . . . . . .28

Involvement of Non-public School Children. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .28

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Page

Programs designed for Handicapped Children under Title I ESEA. . . . 31
  Five most effective projects administered by LEAs for Handicapped Children. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 32
    SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAM FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN . . . . 32
    ENRICHMENT PROGRAM FOR THE HANDICAPPED . . . . . . . . . . . 33
    A SPEECH THERAPY PROGRAM . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 33
    OPERATION HELP . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35

SECTION III PROBLEMS RESOLVED. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 36

Problem Areas Satisfactorily Resolved. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 36
Problem Areas Requiring Legislative Changes. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 37

PART II TABULAR DATA

Average Daily Attendance and Average Daily Membership Rates . . . . . . . 39
Drop Out Rates. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 40
Standardized Test Results . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 41
Continuing Education. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 56

PART III EXEMPLARY PROJECTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 58

# PROLOGUE

## IMPACT OF TITLE I IN THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

There are many major aspects of education now existing in the State of Rhode Island that we feel result directly or indirectly from Title I activity. Improvement to or development of physical facilities, instructional techniques, teaching and auxiliary staffs and special program development are tangible changes.

Eighty-seven percent of the teacher aides employed in the State of Rhode Island are paid by Title I funds. Prior to the advent of Title I, teacher aides were few in number, and a discussion about them was frequent but seldom implemented. A recent study, A Study of Teacher Aides in Rhode Island Schools, funded by New England Educational Assessment Project, showed that 70% of the Rhode Island communities either have employed aides, or have an interest in employing aides in the future. According to the survey, only four schools had employed aides in 1965 and nineteen communities now employ a total of 262 aides. It is evident that Title I has had a great impact on the use of teacher aides in this state. Title I funds have paved the way for aides to undertake a new and important role in the education of our youth. These teacher aides are freeing professional people from routine tasks and thereby increasing the amount of time teachers are able to work with children directly,

The consensus of Rhode Island school people (staff and students), reflects a picture of enthusiasm and vigor in classrooms around the state. A large quantity of audio-visual materials and supplies used as learning aides are now available as instructional media to assist in motivating or bringing about behavioral changes in project participants, as well as reinforcing the total school program. In fact, the situation in education today is frequently described as vibrant, exploratory, challenging and child-centered. The trend has changed from examining the school needs to examining the children's needs. These attitudes are in part, an outgrowth of Title I philosophy and activity.

Professionals who are non-educators are becoming more involved in the educational process as a consequence of the implementation of Title I philosophy. Large numbers of non-teaching specialists are being called upon to use their expertise in diagnostic and consultant work involving these children and the learning difficulties associated with them. A combined total of 301 psychologists, social workers, nurses, physicians, dentists, and other professional personnel serviced thirty-nine communities with their Title I programs.

In most instances, these projects were implemented in existing facilities; however, instructional media and learning centers of the portable and prefabricated types were funded in several communities where no extra space was available to care for these deprived children. Title I activities caused these communities to reassess their available classroom space. Rooms not available for instructional purposes before were altered to meet these needs and supplied with the instructional materials and equipment needed to carry out the program.

By providing classroom space never available before, and increasing teaching and counseling staff, these communities were able to reduce class size to a more appropriate level, provide for tutorial arrangements, and bring about the curriculum modifications necessary to meet the special needs of participating children.

After school and summer Title I programs have led to increased utilization of the school buildings as well as providing extended professional employment for the teaching staffs. Teachers, who were previously "moonlighting" and taking non-professional employment for summer months in order to balance their budgets, are now employed on a professional basis.

Some impacts of Title I that are not so obvious are the opportunity it has given the teachers to experiment with new educational methods and procedures such as utilizing the team approach by integrating all facets of education, and allowing staff to participate in in-service training in programs specifically designed to meet the needs of these children.

Title I philosophy seems to be having a "spin off" effect in the State of Rhode Island. Local school systems appear to be placing more attention on individual student needs rather than school needs. Title I experimental programs are being incorporated into the school curriculums by the local educational agencies. The most astonishing "spin off" effect is the incorporation of Title I programs into the regular school programs when the effectiveness of these programs has been demonstrated.

Utilization of the team approach and the involvement of "parents-as-partners" in the educational process of their children are not only effective in assessing and meeting the needs of deprived children at every possible experience level, but they also became an effective disseminatory device. Parents of Title I children attending P.T.A. meetings and other parent oriented school functions are "spreading the word" of Title I, and parents of children not eligible for Title I programs, are demanding equal attention for their children. This new concern for education which is causing many local school systems to implement and fund these projects from general school funds.

A more realistic understanding of general needs of education and culturally disadvantaged children seems to be resulting in the increased ability to help the disadvantaged child and not just teach subject matter.

Fifty-one percent of the school systems in Rhode Island have recognized low achievement in reading and reading related fields as a primary need for improvement in their educational systems. The total state expenditure on all projects was $3,578,640. Of this, $1,985,742. went to reading and reading related fields. This represents 57% of the total amount approved for all projects. Rhode Island had thirty-nine out of forty school districts participate in Title I programs during fiscal year 1966-67. Included in these thirty-nine school districts was a total of eighty-eight projects that enrolled 14,118 public school children and 3,589 private school children. The staff was broken down into full time academic year, part time academic year, full-time summer, and part-time summer.

The full time academic year staff included 763 teachers, and other professional and non-professionals. The part time academic year staff included 1,043 teachers. The full-time summer programs involved a staff of 864 persons and the part-time summer programs included a staff of 148 teachers and other professional and non-professionals participating in the Title I projects.

The above examples illustrate the role that Title I has assumed in the state. Thirty-nine of forty local educational agencies have participated in Title I projects during fiscal year 1966-67. This active participation by LEAs indicates enthusiastic support for this program. The responsible involvement by the LEAs is documented by the following state summary based on a 100% return of local evaluation reports.

## 1. MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

By far the largest number of fiscal 1967 Title I projects in Rhode Island was in the instructional area of remedial reading. That general area encompassed specific programs which differed fairly extensively from community to community, depending on the availability of personnel, budget, students' needs and inventiveness of those responsible for planning and implementing the program. The entire group of programs, however, has had an undeniable impact on the educationally disadvantaged student in Rhode Island and certainly qualifies as a major Title I achievement having statewide significance.

The central function of reading in a student's entire educational experience is well documented. It is not surprising, therefore, that so large a number of programs designed to improve verbal skills and understanding were established to serve the educationally disadvantaged.

The total number of students in Rhode Island who have profited from remedial reading programs alone is in the vicinity of 10,000. Were not Title I funds available only 10% or so of that number would ever have received remedial instruction in reading. In October, 1965, the ratio of special reading teachers to students in public schools in Rhode Island was 1-3000. Forty-five of the current remedial reading programs are new activities to the LEA. Only six programs are extensions of previously operated programs.

Local schools find such programs terribly expensive and perhaps more importantly, would not have been able to staff such remedial reading programs. Title I has provided a solution to this problem. The number of teachers receiving some sort of in-service training in remedial reading is about 373. The staffing problem of specialists, be they reading, guidance, social workers or others is by no means solved in Rhode Island. But a beginning has been made to provide teachers with the opportunity to learn the skills of a special area within the field of education. During the first year of Title I, i.e. fiscal year '66, we found that the majority of unused but allocated funds had been budgeted for staff positions which could not be filled. A minimum amount of unused monies was returned during fiscal year '67 for this reason.

A significant effect of the establishment of so many remedial reading programs and the resulting staffing problems was a recognition on the part of the state university and college of the need for advanced courses and graduate programs of instruction in these areas. The University of Rhode Island established a master's degree program in Reading in 1964 and within the past eighteen months this program was expanded. Rhode Island College has also established a similar program. Previously, neither institution offered more than a few courses in reading and had not the machinery whereby a candidate would concentrate or major in this particular speciality.

Title I has had a statewide impact in yet another way. As a direct result of the existence of Title I funded programs in Rhode Island communities, the State Testing Program has taken on a new look. In 1963, the Rhode Island State Legislature passed legislation requiring the State Department of Education to conduct an annual statewide testing program. The program adopted involves all 4th and 6th grade children in all public and non-public schools. The testing was conducted, yet the results were not always used as effectively as ideally possible. This is not surprising since local facilities, time and money were not always available to provide special services for the child who needed them.

The State Department Consultant who filled the newly created position of Elementary Guidance Consultant was concerned about the State Testing Program Results not having a feedback relation to classroom instruction. With the incentive of Title I funds available to set up special programs and under the expert tutilage of the Elementary Guidance consultant, the LEAs are now seriously studying the State Testing Program results. The data are being used as a basis for selecting priority programs of instruction. There is now a reason to assess students needs. Title I provides an opportunity to fulfill those needs.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

### a. SEA Service to LEAs

The SEA made available to any LEA consultants in a variety of instructional and service areas. Some consultants were members of the State Department of Education staff, others were college and university personnel, public school personnel and medical specialists. Consultants served in the areas of reading, speech and hearing, special education, psychological services, in-service training, group dynamics, language arts, curriculum development, secondary education, pre-school education, science and mathematics education, audio-visual communications, and guidance. These consultants served the LEA at the SEA's expense. They could be asked to assist the LEA at any or all stages of the project, that is, during the development, implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of the project. A few communities made effective use of these consultants. Many LEAs made no use of them. One of the SEA's problems is to find a way to have the LEAs make optimal use of the professional talent available to them. There appears to be a lack of awareness of the role of consultant services.

1) Project Development

Most assistance given the LEAs in project development was of an individual nature. Individual conferences were held with all project planners requesting such assistance. At these meetings the Title I coordinator would point out the strengths and weaknesses of the project plan, recommend changes where appropriate, discuss budget matters and at times suggest that a project planner visit an existing program in some other LEA. Special arrangements were made to show the films, "A Chance to Learn," and "Off and Running" to those communities whose original project proposals reflected a lack of understanding of the philosophy of Title I. Whenever possible the SEA attempted to share new ideas with personnel throughout the state. Many materials developed in the State Office and those from the Office of Education which were of relevance to project development were distributed statewide. This function to the State Department is discussed more fully in 2-a-4: Information Dissemination.

In late summer the Title I office arranged a dutch treat luncheon at a local restaurant to which LEA officials and Community Action Program officials were invited. The objective of the meeting was to find ways to tap the facilities of the CAP in identifying the needs of the youngsters in the target areas and to seek new ways of utilizing community resources.

2) Project Implementation

Members of the Title I staff and consultants made frequent site visits to projects in operation. The LEA personnel were encouraged to discuss any operational problems with the staff in hopes of finding appropriate solutions. If the solutions could be accomplished through the use of amendments, this was freely allowed.

In more than one instance, a State Department consultant assisted an LEA in finding staff to man their programs.

3) Project Evaluation

As a member state of the New England Assessment Project, we lobbied strongly for this group to find some means of helping the LEAs assess the effectiveness of their educational procedures. Early last winter, a booklet entitled "A Guide to Assessment and Evaluation Procedures," was published by the New England Assessment Project. It is clearly written and covers a variety of assessment techniques. We felt that any local project director might find it helpful in the evaluation of his particular program. Copies of this booklet were sent to all superintendents, Title I coordinators, project directors, consultants, and CAP directors.

In late May and early June, a series of three meetings was held to acquaint project personnel responsible for evaluation with the requirements for evaluation for fiscal year '67 projects. (We found late May and early June extremely inconvenient times for such meetings. However, since the first draft copy of the federal guidelines was not available to SEA until April 28th, we were unable to get state guidelines to the LEAs before late May.) At these meetings the state guidelines were distributed, discussed and explained. There was spontaneous agreement that these guidelines looked clearer than those of the previous year.

One new aspect of this year's evaluation was the inclusion of Tables 7A and 7B, Standardized Test Results. We felt that these tables might require more than usual clarification. Therefore, we "manufactured" a set of fictitious class data on pre- and post-test results for a sixth grade group on a standardized reading test. Using that class data, we completed both Tables 7A and 7B. Copies of the fictitious data and the two completed sample tables were included as aides in the guideline booklet.

Advice about evaluation was available at all times through the Title I office. The state Title I coordinator, the consultant on evaluation, and two newly added supervisors of compensatory education were available via telephone, conferences or through site visits to discuss problems in evaluation.

### 4) Information Dissemination

#### a) Title I Bulletin

A Title I bulletin has been published at approximately bi-monthly intervals during the year. This is prepared by the SEA and distributed to all superintendents, Title I coordinators, project directors, CAP personnel, and consultants. It includes information about the current state of legislation about Title I, state guidelines, fiscal matters and suggestions for programs appropriate for disadvantaged youth. A sample copy of one such bulletin is included in the Appendix.

#### b) Brochures

Numerous brochures which are received or purchased by the SEA Title I office are considered of sufficient value for distribution to the LEAs. Some which have been so distributed are: A Chance for a Change, National Advisory Council's Report on Title I, E.S.E.A., Summer Program for 1965, Auxiliary School Personnel, Rhode Island Statewide Study of Reading Programs, How to use Federal Funds for Summer Programs, Staffing for Better Schools.

c) Films

The New England Assessment Project contracted with Eastern Educational Network to produce three films about Title I in New England. The NEEAP also published a teachers' handbook to accompany each film. Copies of the films were provided each state agency in the six member states of the New England Assessment Project. The Rhode Island SEA has loaned these films to various school groups, such as PTAs, faculty groups, and college classes in teacher education. They have been shown in some in-service training programs. The SEA staff (non-Title I) has also had an opportunity to see these films. The films have also been shown on local television.

d) News Releases

Upon approval of a Title I project, a news release highlighting various aspects of the program is distributed to the many large and small local newspapers in Rhode Island, the television stations and all radio stations and the governor's office. The mailing list for news releases numbers 55. In addition, a copy of the release is sent to every superintendent in the state, all Title I coordinators, project directors, and consultants. This mailing list for each news release numbers about 275. A collection of these news releases is in effect an abstract of every approved project in Rhode Island. A copy of any particular release is sent to every public and parochial school in the community whose project approval is being announced.

e) Speech and Lectures

The State Title I coordinator has spoken to numerous groups about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. He has been the guest of many local PTA and Parochial Parents Guild Groups. He has been a speaker at the annual meeting of the Rhode Island Education Association, Rhode Island Association of School Principals, Rhode Island Association of School Superintendents, several college classes, and some in-service training programs. He is called upon to provide information about the programs to both local and state officials.

f) Sunday Supplement

Our most ambitious venture in the field of dissemination was the production of an eight page magazine which was included as a supplement to the Providence Journal Sunday edition of September 24, 1967. In pictorial and narrative form we tried to tell the story of Title I to the people of Rhode Island. We wanted the people of Rhode Island to know what such a program can do for the children of the state.

The Providence Journal is the only Rhode Island paper published on Sundays. The circulation is 250,000 in Rhode Island, parts of neighboring Massachusetts, and Connecticut. According to the Journal's estimates, one million people read the paper that day. While the absolute cost of such a project is expensive, the cost per reader is minimal, less than one cent per reader. No other kind of publication could have been produced at such a small per reader cost.

In the event that educators in the state had missed receiving the supplement, copies were distributed widely among the education community in Rhode Island. In addition, copies were sent to all chief state school officers in the United States, all state Title I coordinators, all Title II, and Title III coordinators in the United States and all special education supervisors.

### b. Most Pressing Educational Needs

In order to determine the most pressing educational needs of disadvantaged children in the state of Rhode Island, the LEAs were asked to submit a list of their most pressing pupil needs and arrange them in rank order. We at the SEA compiled this data from the LEA evaluations and made a tally of the most pressing needs of disadvantaged children in the state. Thirty-four out of thirty-nine LEAs reported that remedial reading was their primary need. This reflects 87% of the communities.

A survey of the state submitted to the SEA by the LEA, (table 7A) indicated that the majority of the children participating in the Title I reading projects were below the 50th percentile of the national norms for the reading surveys given.

Twenty-five of thirty-nine communities, or 67% of those reporting indicated that inadequate command of language was the State's second most pressing educational need.

Most communities reported that more than half of the disadvantaged scored low in language on national norms of standardized tests. They also indicated that poor spoken language was used by the children in many of the schools.

Some communities also indicated that there is a large influx of Portuguese speaking children at all grade levels within the public schools and that language programs had to be developed to cope with this segment of the school population. Teacher evaluations also showed inadequate vocabularies and written skills for these children.

Twenty-four of thirty-four communities or approximately 70% of those LEAs reporting indicated inadequate cultural opportunities as their third most pressing educational need. This was most evident in evaluations coming from LEAs located in rural districts. Those LEAs reporting this as a primary need use counselor recommendations, family backgrounds, teacher recommendations, and general knowledge of cultural opportunities available to these children in their local areas as a basis for establishing this need. In one instance, a student questionnaire was used to determine the impact the lack of cultural opportunities had on these children.

Twenty-one out of thirty-nine communities recorded inadequate command of a specific academic subject as their fourth most pressing need. Again, most of these communities based this need on standardized achievement tests in various academic disciplines, such as social studies, science, language arts, and mathematics.

Seventeen out of thirty-nine communities indicated inadequate social opportunities for the disadvantaged children within their target areas. This was reflected in the children's attitudes and behaviorial patterns when exposed to situations involving social intercourse. In many of the rural districts, the disadvantaged children are not given the opportunity to indulge in the social practices often extended to urban and suburban disadvantaged children.

c. Most Prevalent Project Objectives: The following are the five most prevalent project objectives as compiled from the LEAs annual evaluation reports and listed in rank order.

Primary Objectives:

1. To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.
2. To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests.
3. To improve classroom performance in other skill areas beyond usual expectations.
4. To help upgrade the cultural level of educationally deprived children.
5. To improve the children's verbal functioning.

Secondary Objectives:

1. To improve children's verbal functioning.
2. To improve classroom performance in other skill areas beyond usual expectations.
3. To help upgrade the cultural level of educationally deprived children.
4. To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.
5. To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests.

Most Prevalent Project Objectives (cont.)

1) The Most Effective Approaches Used to Reach Each Objective:

a) Many and varied approaches were employed to improve classroom performance in reading. The effectiveness of all of these approaches was measured by standardized achievement tests. The following is a description of the activities employed by one LEA whose project we consider most effective in achieving their objectives:

> Pupils were selected for testing on the basis of available reading test scores of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and teacher referrals. Those pupils referred were then pre-tested with the Durrell-Reading Inventory and teacher-made checklists designed specifically to identify specific language disabilities.
>
> All project activities were conducted in a relocatable classroom purchased with Title I funds. This building, known as the "reading clinic," was equipped with controlled readers, mechanical tachistoscopes, individual carrels, tape recorders, overhead projectors, and library listening centers.
>
> The program operated in several 6-week sessions, followed by one week for consultation and evaluation purposes. Each session involved approximately 118 students some of whom were involved in both sessions.
>
> During the first week an "analytical dictation" was administered to each class. The same procedure was followed at the end of each session, and results noted on each student's program record. Each student was shown how to operate the available equipment.

After the teachers' evaluation of the daily progress sheets, provided as a comprehension check for the series, the student was instructed whether to accelerate, decrease, or change the format of the instructional media in which he was working. While each carrel houses an EDL jr., the automated character of the Reading Clinic enabled many activities to function simultaneously. Some students used controlled readers, while others were at a listening center using materials specifically geared for improvement in critical thinking, literature appreciation and poetry. The listening center proved to be the "dark horse" of the clinic, as its versatility was unbound. It was discovered that the youngsters could be grouped to listen and read, using a multi-sensory approach, for specific data improvement, for spelling lessons, dictation and humorous stories.

During a part of everyday the teacher heard an oral selection and worked in a tutorial capacity on some specific phase of learning troublesome to the student. This one-to-one relationship was most valuable not only from the academic point of view but for the rapport established between each teacher and her student. Specific academic problems were often brought to the teacher's attention without the social stigma often attached to "not knowing."

Through oral reading, both to the teacher and by using the tape recorder, the student was able to hear himself, note weaknesses and so improve his confidence and ability. Materials were specifically chosen for recording progress of varying degrees of difficulty so that each child would experience success. The tape recorders were most popular and students experimented with different imaginative formats such as interviewing visiting dignitaries or presenting a dramatic reading.

All the participants had acute spelling disabilities. In addition to using stimulating software such as the Manter Hall Series, the visual EDL Tachistoscopic spelling series proved both interesting and effective.

There was a daily library period conducted by the Project Aide. Since she had made it a practice to read most of the library materials as they arrived, she was able to explain to students what the books were about. The situation for the poorer reader rapidly improved as they were guided to books on their level that were not so immature in appearance and subject matter that their pride was injured.

As the need for reading improvement was most acute, most of the period was spent in using materials programmed to gain this area. The EDL jrs. were used daily following the suggested evaluation procedure specifically designed for the controlled readers, yet augmenting the comprehension series by informal questions. The comprehension series were the only EDL materials which were used in groups, most of the students, however, worked individually or, in the case of recording selections or interviews, in pairs. Teachers found the students became more sophisticated in both techniques and knowledge from the use of the comprehension series. Starting at a slow speed the student would read a paragraph containing factual data. When the teacher stopped the machine and asked the pertinent questions, many youngsters were initially confused. However, as this technique was used more often, the students found themselves reading more quickly for specific information and retaining the factual data. They were surprised and pleased to master this phase. Although the material was below their grade level, almost all the students were reading at least 250 words per minute. It should be mentioned that all the students began to read at eighty words per minute. Throughout each session of the Reading Program, teachers met to discuss specific students. While each student might not have gained in actual months commensurate to the teachers hopes, the confidence gained by all the youngsters was remarkable.

In response to a need to increase the students' command of the English language, both oral and written, they wrote stories which they recorded or illustrated on the overhead projector. Involving the student in the use of AV media was found to be most effective, and they displayed an unusual creativity in recording interviews and reading selections and gained a substantial appreciation for literature.

As it was felt that the multi-sensory approach was most meaningful, teachers would record selections from literature for use at the listening center. The student would hear the teacher read in a lucid manner while he followed the same selection in his book. This technique was also used for spelling in the Listen and Think series.

Almost all of the students had difficulty in spelling even though many had studied this subject from a phonetic approach for many years. The Tach-X was found to be most useful and stimulating, strengthening the visual retention of the spelling words and developing visual acuity. A spelling series for use with the Tach-X was employed. The teachers compiled a spelling test from a Basic 4th, 5th, and 6th grade Dolch vocabulary test which was given the first week of the final session. After using the series twice weekly, the original test was given again. The results showed a marked improvement.

The following procedure was used with the tachistoscope. The tachistoscope was blurred while the teacher dictated a word and the student would then write this word. The Tach-X was cleared and the student checked his paper. Actually, he was writing the word three times but the approach was stimulating even to the teachers who would flash the words more quickly each session. It was interesting to note that the youngsters wanted more difficult words.

b) The most effective approach used to improve classroom performance in other skill areas beyond usual expectations was employed in project "Upward and Onward," a project conducted by a large school department. The overall objectives of the summer project, "Upward and Onward" were to create a positive attitude, or effect a change in attitude, toward more positive views concerning classroom learning specifically in science.

"Upward and Onward" employed a methodology where pupils were introduced to science through demonstration experiments performed by the teachers. The method of motivation implemented, served to immediately interest the students since the demonstrations were new and amazing to most of them.

In an experiment, acid and sugar caused formation of a new black, moving mass. This gave some students an opportunity to express their understanding of the necessity for careful observation in science. Several were able to tell us that this is "burning" of sugar; but generally, understanding of the chemical action was not gained, nor called for. The sole purpose of several such "Magic" tricks was to gain attention and invite curiosity.

Following the introductory demonstrations and brief discussions of the meaning of science, students started their own experiments.

(1) Work was done in pairs, small groups of 3 or 4, and in some cases individually.

(2) All started with experiments dealing with properties of air, using the principles of the scientific method (problem, materials, observations.)

   (a) Air is something familiar to all

   (b) All knew air is essential to life

   (c) Few knew any properties of air or its utilization in everyday activities

(3) Each group, (that is, each working group), started with a different experiment with some instructions.

   (a) Some could work only with careful supervision

   (b) Some groups were able to deviate from the initial experiment and devise their own extensions

(c) Some students decided to separate from the group and work on experiments that others were doing because of interest through observations of others.

(4) Upon completion and recording of the first experiment each group could proceed at its own speed to another experiment.

(a) Some performed, discussed, and evaluated only one experiment of the first series

(b) Others completed 4 or 5 experiments

(c) Inductive reasoning was encouraged in evaluations of each experiment

(5) While half of each class worked on experiments, the other half participated in discussion of the meaning of "science" and were introduced to a history of science. The groups alternated their work to give all an opportunity to work on history and experiments:

(a) Notebooks were started with the lists of events in science development, and names of famous scientists.

(b) Students cut out and pasted in their notebooks pictures of the steps in the development of civilization that related to science (such as discovery of fire, cooking, etc.)

(c) Students were then encouraged to select a topic relating to science and to develop its history or create an exhibit as a continuing project for the duration of the program.

(d) Time was given for research in the library.

(6) Individual projects were selected by a few students due to their interests and were worked on during class.

  (a) One student selected electricity; he was provided with a "walkie-talkie" which was disassembled and its functions explained, analyzed, and labeled.

  (b) A rocket-launching platform was assembled and explained by one student during classtime.

Pupils were free to move about the classroom during class to get materials necessary and could discuss their experiments with others; each group had its own table to work on.

Another room was used for discussion groups while the history of science was being introduced and chairs were arranged in a circular fashion to enable comfortable, relaxed discussions.

c) To help upgrade and improve the childrens' verbal functioning, another large city initiated and implemented a project in language development as a part of their overall project, "GRASP."

English classes for children from non-english speaking homes were conducted daily on an hourly basis during the summer program. Classes were conducted in target area schools. There were 85 children who participated in the program.

A language teacher, speech-therapist and two aides worked in a team situation. Children were instructed on an individual basis, as well as a small group basis.

The speech therapist strengthened the efforts of the language teacher by providing follow-up activities. Each child was given a speech and hearing evaluation test. Therapy was provided on an individual basis for those selected.

The combination of language teacher and speech therapist was most significant in that there was a natural follow-up of activities.

The speech therapist worked with small groups using the Bell & Howell Language Master. Other AV equipment was used such as overhead projector, filmstrip viewer and tape recorder. EDL material was used as well as the Language Experience program published by Stone Bridge Press. Other individualized material was developed and prepared by the language teacher with the assistance of two aides. Integration of reading with the program was limited at this time. Stress was definitely placed upon vocabulary building, communication skill and experience learning.

Children were grouped according to their language needs.

The language teacher was able to spend at least 50 minutes a day with each group at each center.

Children were able to participate to some degree in the physical education program; however, this was limited by time schedules. They did participate regularly in the recreation program. At the discretion of the language teacher, children were integrated with the regular remedial group for field trips, bus excursions, train trips and trips to the beach. This proved to be most beneficial for both groups. Shyness, fear and apprehension was overcome by socializing together. New friends were made.

The Social Worker together with the Language Teacher visited the homes of these children. Personal contact was made with each family. Transportation was arranged by the social worker for particular children. Health services were also arranged for this group.

These first ten weeks were an excellent orientation period for the team as well as the non-english speaking group. It provided opportunities for diagnosing immediate needs, as well as recommending a more definite program for the future. It also provided an opportunity for establishing definite guidelines in attacking the growing problems of the non-english speaking child in the school situation.

Mention must be made of the outstanding competence of the language team. The language teacher and speech therapist were highly qualified people, most sympathetic and patient with the group and extremely professional in their approach to this problem. The aides were trained by the language teacher and strengthened efforts of the teachers in providing a strong "team approach."

d) An effective approach to upgrade the cultural level of the educationally deprived child was employed by one large school system in a summer program of School Library Services. This was a four week program involving 212 public school pupils and eighteen non-public school pupils.

(1) Each schools' activities took place in a library and adjoining learning center built with Title I funds the previous fiscal year. Each center was staffed with a certified librarian, a teacher, and an aid. The children were divided into small groups and each morning was divided into four time periods.

During the small group sessions, academic subject matter areas were supplemented by library resources and library materials. "We wanted the children to gain experience in and become familiar with the school library in order to understand its role in the learning situation." The students used art and science materials in order to develop projects which were related to their summer learning experience. Educational trips were employed to motivate the children in the use of library resources, to learn more about a specific place, person, or subject and to read stories related to that area of interest.

Bibliographies were prepared relating to each trip. Selections from these bibliographies were utilized in preparing the disadvantaged youth for what they might encounter on the cultural trip. Several days prior to the trip, the children became totally involved in the planning of the event. Each child possessed a map of Rhode Island and nearby Massachusetts on which he kept a record of his trips. Listening tapes, stories, films, filmstrips and records were utilized in acquainting the child with the cultural surroundings which he was to visit.

Some of the areas included trips to the Historic Seaport in Mystic, Connecticut, Boston Childrens' Museum, the Rhode Island Seashore, a model farm at the University of Rhode Island, the U.S.S Massachusetts and a woodland nature excursion.

Music, art, drama, and science were included in the various aspects of the program. The staff included a trained music teacher, who planned singing games, appreciation of music through recordings, group singing and a discussion of orchestral instruments. The teachers in the program planned numerous art and craft experiences that related to the trips and famous books.

Dramatic presentations were planned and executed by the children as they related to their reading. The children wrote skits based upon stories and presented several to parent groups.

A male physical education teacher provided recreational activity to introduce variety and relaxation into the day's program activities. A male was selected in order to provide a male image which is frequently lacking in the home of the culturally deprived child.

A circulation of 3,650 books for home reading and browsing is an indication of one of the strengths of the program. Not only did the students borrow the books, but many asked to be given copies of the books. This interest ran so high that the LEA purchased paperback copies with Title I funds for distribution to the students.

### d. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs

1) ESEA, Titles II, III, V [illegible]

a) Title II

Every school system in Rhode Island has received funds for library books and instructional media under Title II, ESEA. Seventeen communities reported that their Title I activities were supplemented by those of Title II. There is a clear and obvious relationship in the case of Title I projects in remedial reading, language arts, or in any tutorial program. The books purchased have been used in one of two ways, either to strengthen skills developed in the Title I program or as a recreational reading.

One large Rhode Island school system commented on the interrelatedness of Title I and II in the following way:

> "....Legislation affecting Title II should permit expenditures under this Title to be in areas other than simply the purchasing of books. Funds under this Title should be utilized for additional library staff, the purchase of equipment and possible remodeling of library learning centers. The limited scope of Title II makes the successful integration with the Title I programs difficult."

b) Title III

Four communities have reported an interrelationship between their Title I projects and Title III of ESEA.

One community reports that their Title III planning grant, "Work, Its Meaning and Dignity" was an outgrowth of a Title I project. Also, their current Title III program, "Eyes Have They but They See Not" resulted from work done within a Title I program.

Another communtiy reports an in-service workshop associated with a demonstration library that another school system had financed under Title III of ESEA.

The third community states that:

> "Title I, P.L. 89-10 supplies funds which establishes a center for special education and special services. This center serves as a diagnostic and consultative center for placement and processing of the children into the Title III program, Resource Rooms for Children with Specific Learning Disabilities."

The fourth community states:

> "Our Title III project is limited to one school and a model library program for statewide demonstration purposes. In this regard, through visits by local school officials, we are attempting to stimulate library improvement on a statewide basis. We are integrating Titles I, II, and III in a coordinated effort to upgrade the academic achievements of pupils at this school."

c) Title V

Under Title V, two staff consultants received grants to do surveys; a statewide reading survey, and a health survey. Both surveys demonstrated vividly the needs of the educationally deprived children in both reading and health areas. Also, new staff members were added to the state department under Title V, ESEA to serve as consultants. These consultants were used by the LEAs in planning and implementing their programs. These consultants also served as reviewers on Title I project applications.

2) The United States Department of Agriculture Food Program

Several Title I projects provided breakfast, lunch, a snack or combination thereof to its participants. They were subsidized by the Rhode Island Hot Lunch Program (part of the US Department of Agriculture Food Program)

3) Community Action Agency

Of course, all LEAs were required to confer with their local CAPs during the development of any Title I program.

In addition, one large school system reports that its Title I project supplemented a CAP by providing two speech teachers to a Head Start program to give speech instruction to children needing this service.

4) Neighborhood Youth Corps

Three large communities reported using neighborhood youth corps personnel as clerical, custodial, and teacher aides. One community reports, "several Neighborhood Youth Corps Workers were utilized in helping to cart and distribute food to the various pre-K centers each day." Another community reported, "The Neighborhood Youth Corps supplied young people to serve as student aides and to work in various other aspects of title programs."

5) Job Corps

No LEA reported that the Job Corps supplemented its Title I program.

6) Welfare Administration Program

One community reported, "children in need of costly medical care and who are members of families that were welfare recipients were referred to social workers who made arrangements for supplementary medical services through the Department of Social Welfare."

A second reports that Title I activities were supplemented by Welfare Administration programs, but they did not indicate the manner in which this was carried out.

7) Medical Aid to Indigent Families

Two large communities reported that their Title I programs were supplemented by Medical Aid to indigent families. One community reported, "Title XIX funds have been used for families of some clinic patients." The other community indicated that, "Close working relationships have been established with Department of Public Welfare in order to utilize to its fullest extent this particular Title XIX of the Social Security Act in correlation with our Title I programs."

e. Staff Development and Utilization

1) Development and Improvement of SEA Staff Utilization

The Title I office added two full time supervisors this year. One had been a Title I project director, the other, a part-time federal coordinator in the local schools, so, they were familiar both with the philosophy and procedures of Title I. Two clerical positions were also added to the Title I office staff. An efficient office staff has been found to be the most effective means of utilizing the time of the professional staff.

Whenever possible, members of other departments within the SEA are involved in the activities of the Title I office.

This is especially true of State Department consultants in the areas of reading, mathematics, and guidance. As a means of keeping state department personnel informed on Title I activities the Title I coordinator has chaired several staff conferences devoted to this purpose.

2) Development and Improvement of LEA Staff Utilization

Several communities provided for in-service training of their teachers as part of their Title I project. Four hundred and eighty-eight teachers participated in some kind of in-service training program. One of the more unusual of these programs was a summer session workshop attended by teachers from several school systems. The workshop was run by the University of Rhode Island. The objective of this workshop was to develop a secondary level reading program by showing:

a) secondary content teachers what reading skills are
b) secondary content teachers how to incorporate these reading skills in content areas
c) how secondary teachers can individualize their teaching and assignments to adjust for the student who is slow in reading skills
d) secondary content teachers other "content carriers" besides books, such as tapes, filmstrips, etc.

f. Involvement of Non-public School Children

1) The most effective activities in which non-public school children participated involved reading and reading related projects.

a) The SEA attempted to stimulate the involvement of non-public school children in various ways. They included:

Close working cooperation between the SEA Title I Office and the office of the Superintendent of Parochial Schools responded by giving free time to religious specialists to work on the planning of Title I projects. Also, a letter verifying non-public school participation was sent to the Consultant on Compensatory Education indicating plans to involve certain non-public schools in LEA projects.

On-site visitations to parochial schools were made by the Title I staff.

News releases were sent to parochial schools when students enrolled in the school belonged to the attendance areas of LEAs planning to implement Title I project. These news releases described the projects and the plans that the LEAs had made for non-public school participation.

The Consultant on Compensatory Education gave numerous talks at parochial school parent organizations.

The SEA representative met with lay teachers and religious instructors in the parochial schools to explain the legislation and the philosophy of the law.

b) The LEAs attempted to develop and improve staff utilization by involving parochial school teachers in in-service training. Where in-service training was not given, the LEAs met with the staff in the parochial schools to inform them what their project objectives are and methods of implementation.

LEA programs were planned to accomodate non-public school students, who came from the attendance areas, in both time and space. The State of Rhode Island has 3,589 non-public school children and 14,118 public school participants enrolled in Title I funded programs.

2) a) The more effective activities, reading and reading related types of projects were the most commonly funded involving non-public school children.

b) A music project involving 30 non-public school pupils might be considered an innovative project.

This program provided small group instruction in the language arts and music for 65 public school pupils and 39 non-public school pupils in grades 5-7. The project provided time for library exploration and music appreciation. In the music field, classes were given the techniques of playing 5 different instruments and the fundamentals of music. An extensive cultural program was also included where students took weekly trips to various musical events that took place throughout the summer as well as included weekly visits from various instrumental and vocal groups to the school where the children listened to the music that was presented to them. They discussed music with the musicians taking part in the program.

g. Programs Designed for Handicapped Children under Title I ESEA

1) State Consultant for Mentally Retarded Children, in the State Department of Education's Office of Special Education, on many occasions has consulted with LEA Directors on special education programs. Considerable time and assistance was devoted to sitting down and spelling out programs for application under Title I. The applications consisted in many cases of summer programs designed to complement regular special education programs during the academic year, and also used to initiate programs for forthcoming academic years. A specific example of such would be the following:

a) A program for the community of Pawtucket was designed collaboratively with the Title I Supervisor and the Special Education Director of the LEA. This program was set up to screen a population that was generally described as those children functioning at a mentally retarded level. The purpose of screening was to determine those children who might be functioning so as a result of emotional components, neurological characteristics, and also included a program designed as a prevocational senior high for mentally retarded children. Methods used to approach these children after screening were specifically selected to concentrate on their individual problems and included mediums of art, physical education, and field trips designed to develop social and vocational awareness. It was hoped that this type of program would be carried over into the academic year to complement the program if at all possible.

b) There were no formal seminars or sessions on the education of the handicapped under Title I as far as the Special Education Office was concerned. However, the Consultant on Mental Retardation meets monthly with the Directors of Special Education from the LEAs, and on many occasions during these sessions discussions center around program development through ESEA Title I.

c) The State Consultant on Mental Retardation is generally consulted on all special education projects by both the local directors of special education as well as the Title I Consultant on ESEA.

2) Five most effective projects administered by LEAs for handicapped children under Title I ESEA consist of the following:

a) "Summer Enrichment Program for Exceptional Children"

(1) This was a program for the development of socializing skills and cultural stimulation for exceptional children which affected 135 public school children and 5 non-public school children. Three secondary teachers, three elementary teachers, eleven teachers of the handicapped, fifteen teacher aides and a counselor comprised the staff of this project. Children were organized into four groups according to their needs and administered General activities in the areas of sports, and bus trips were taken to places according to the interest level of these children. Activities such as art, music, story telling and group games were utilized within varied groups including groups of children who function as

mentally retarded; but according to teacher observation, exhibited characteristics common to children with neurological impairment. The techniques used in working with brain damaged children were utilized with such a group as so defined. Pre- and post-project tests were utilized in the areas of speech, hearing, physical development, and coordination. In addition, weekly staff meetings were held to discuss the needs and progress of the children. Parents were invited to some of these discussion meetings.

b) A second Enrichment Program for the Handicapped was initiated by a large school department to develop correct health habits, proper personal hygiene habits and social-cultural development in seventy-five ungraded mentally handicapped children attending a large public school. The project staff consisted of six teachers of the handicapped, three teacher aides and a supervisor. The services of a physician and a nurse were available on an as needed basis. During the first week of the project, the staff participated in in-service training conducted by the project director. This week also served to administer the Youth Fitness Test, tests of social and cultural awareness, medical examinations and to examine the case studies of pupils.

c) A Speech Therapy Program for the handicapped in speech and hearing was conducted by a staff including one speech and hearing supervisor, one speech therapist and two speech therapist assistants. The staff worked with 102 speech handicapped children in grades 1-4 in all of the elementary schools of that city, and sixty children in the same grades for the parochial schools. Project activities were conducted during the school day and on Saturday mornings during the regular school year, and four hours daily during the summer. Each child received a mimimum of three-quarters of an hour of instruction each week. Project activities were directed to those children who had maintained some degree of language handicap, including stuttering, articulatory problems and social acceptance.

Two mobile therapy centers were effectively utilized. Each of these centers contained a sound proof booth, hearing evaluation and other special equipment for the remediation of language disturbances. Each child was completely evaluated in order to determine if the origin of his speech problem was auditory, emotional or the result of brain damage. Children whose problems were indicated as severe enough to be beyond the scope of this projects activities were referred to available speech therapists and sent to institutions possessing the facilities to provide therapy for these cases. Those children with functional disorders who could be helped by project activities were given individualized professional therapy designed to aid them to overcome the speech handicaps.

d) The project called "Operation Help," a jointly operated project for fifty-five ungraded children stressed hygiene, environmental understanding, language stimulation, and personal appearances as its primary objectives. These objectives were geared to meet the needs of the mentally retarded participants in terms of improving all habits of classroom performance and performance on standardized tests, and intelligence tests, correcting visual performance, improving emotional and social stability, verbal functioning and self-image and lengthening attention span. The project utilized the services of three teacher aides to carry out any activities prescribed by the certified teachers to develop habits of good grooming and acceptable social conduct in the children.

## 3. PROBLEMS RESOLVED

### a. Three Major Problem Areas Arising during the Year that were Satisfactorily Resolved

1) An improved working relationship with the Office of Economic Opportunity was established. There now exists a more coordinated effort by the SEA and the OEO on the state level. A luncheon workshop was conducted with representatives of the SEA, OEO, and LEAs on both the state and local level. This resulted in better understanding between the groups along with a totally coordinated effort. Also, the state technical assistance office supplied a state "check off system" to see if cooperation did exist on the Community Action Statement.

2) In-service training programs in specialized areas conducted on the University and College level have tended to decrease the teacher shortages in these specialized areas on the local elementary and secondary level.

3) Communications between the SEA and LEAs has presented somewhat of a problem. To compensate for this, the SEA has hired two additional staff members as Supervisors of Compensatory Education. These additional staff members have released the Intermediate Auditor from other duties to do more technical fiscal assistance. This has resulted in better communications between the SEA and LEAs through bulletins, news letters and visitations made available by the additional staff.

b. The only major problem with present legislation and appropriation is the late date at which the act is passed resulting in late fiscal appropriation. We feel it would be more advantageous to have the act passed in early spring so funding could take place prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

Early funding would allow the LEAs to be more competitive in hiring the necessary personnel to staff the projects.

# PART II

# TABULAR DATA

TABLE 1

## AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

| GRADE | 1964 - 1965 | | | | | | 1965 - 1966 | | | | | | 1966 - 1967 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Title I Schools | | | | All Other Public Schools | | Title I Schools | | | | All Other Public Schools | | Title I Schools | | | | All Other Public Schools | |
| | ALL | | 1/3 or More Participants1/ | | | | ALL | | 1/3 or More Participants1/ | | | | ALL | | 1/3 or More Participants1/ | | | |
| | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM | ADA | ADM |
| 12th | 1098 | 1184 | -- | -- | 2091 | 2255 | 2250 | 2451 | -- | -- | 2769 | 2988 | 2364 | 2586 | 144 | 150 | 4774 | 5191 |
| 11th | 1073 | 1150 | -- | -- | 2327 | 2500 | 2394 | 2611 | -- | -- | 2911 | 3149 | 2637 | 3893 | 150 | 159 | 4945 | 5324 |
| 10th | 1140 | 1202 | -- | -- | 2349 | 2514 | 2469 | 2700 | -- | -- | 3089 | 3329 | 2727 | 2976 | 152 | 163 | 5928 | 5392 |
| 9th | 744 | 805 | -- | -- | 2838 | 2834 | 2047 | 2226 | -- | -- | 4111 | 4388 | 3900 | 4156 | 707 | 885 | 5877 | 6268 |
| 8th | 1039 | 1101 | -- | -- | 3241 | 3446 | 3053 | 3323 | -- | -- | 3533 | 3782 | 5184 | 5625 | 844 | 955 | 5101 | 5651 |
| 7th | 1262 | 1343 | -- | -- | 3206 | 3386 | 3119 | 3387 | -- | -- | 3572 | 3784 | 5067 | 5676 | 859 | 956 | 5730 | 6139 |
| 6th | 1038 | 1090 | -- | -- | 3456 | 3616 | 5444 | 5885 | -- | -- | 6011 | 6398 | 4562 | 4483 | 106 | 109 | 6109 | 6492 |
| 5th | 629 | 662 | -- | -- | 4113 | 4368 | 4472 | 4765 | -- | -- | 6785 | 7184 | 4023 | 4761 | 1041 | 1118 | 5849 | 6377 |
| 4th | 570 | 600 | -- | -- | 4340 | 4606 | 4764 | 5076 | -- | -- | 6321 | 6742 | 4299 | 4147 | 933 | 1001 | 6578 | 5613 |
| 3rd | 948 | 1011 | -- | -- | 2876 | 3015 | 5066 | 5403 | -- | -- | 5586 | 5928 | 2136 | 2237 | 895 | 978 | 5883 | 6081 |
| 2nd | 941 | 1011 | -- | -- | 3022 | 3208 | 4918 | 5314 | -- | -- | 5519 | 5896 | 3962 | 4341 | 797 | 873 | 6509 | 6996 |
| 1st | 727 | 776 | -- | -- | 3425 | 3689 | 5689 | 6255 | -- | -- | 6246 | 6769 | 4481 | 5453 | 890 | 1016 | 7176 | 7655 |
| Spec. Ed. ~~Pre-Kind~~ | -- | -- | -- | -- | 173 | 188 | 707 | 863 | -- | -- | 954 | 1144 | 2732 | 3121 | 605 | 694 | 19788 | 21317 |
| Kind | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 722 | 845 | -- | -- | 980 | 1144 | 104 | 133 | 99 | 127 | 278 | 319 |
| Ungraded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total public school enroll-ment | | | | | | | | | | | | | ADA: 48178<br>ADM: 53588 | | ADA: 8222<br>ADM: 9184 | | ADA: 90525<br>ADM: 94815 | |

---

1/ Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

TABLE 2

## DROPOUT RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

| GRADE | 1963 - 1964 | | | 1964 - 1965 | | | 1965 - 1966 | | | 1966 - 1967 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools |
| | ALL | 1/3 or More Participants[1] | | ALL | 1/3 or More Participants[1] | | ALL | 1/3 or More Participants[1] | | ALL | 1/3 or More Participants[1] | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | 3.2% | | 3.2% |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | 5.5 | | 4.8 |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | 5.8 | | 5.7 |
| 9 | ADEQUATE INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE | | | | | | | | | 3.7 | | 5.4 |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | 1.9 | | 1.47 |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | 1.4 | | .62 |
| (Lower grade levels, if appropriate) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. of Schools | 4 | | 29 | 4 | | 29 | 30 | | 36 | 47 | | 38 |
| Total No. of Students | 1413 | | 14349 | 1349 | | 14736 | 10228 | | 18138 | 39698 | | 1185 |
| No. of Dropouts | | | | | | | | | | | | |

---

[1] Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

# NOTES ON TABLES 7A

## Standardized Test Results

Local communities submitted Tables 7A and 7B in their evaluation reports. The following State results on standardized tests are based on these local submissions. When an attempt was made to collate tables representing data on the same test in the same grade, it was found that State totals were based on very few projects and communities. Of those tables representing the same test in the same grade some were not usable due to errors and omissions. As a result, the State totals on Table 7A are not complete. As much data as possible is included in the following tables.

The number of local Tables 7B was so small as to make State totals on 7B meaningless. Therefore, only Tables 7A follow.

# TABLE 7A
# STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

## Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 1

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Gates Primary Word Recognition Reading | | | 22 | | | 4 | 2 | 10 | 6 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Gates Primary and Word Recognition Reading | | | 22 | | | 6 | 0 | 6 | 10 |

*Data based on two summer programs.

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 1

| Name of Test and Each Subsection | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| **PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS** | | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement Reading Paragraph Meaning | | | 33 | 14.6 | | 24 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| **POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS** | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement Reading Paragraph Meaning | | | 33 | 20.1 | | 12 | 12 | 6 | 3 |

*Data based on two summer programs.
*D

CTIONS

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

rade 2

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| SRA Reading Achievement | | | 17 | | | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| SRA Reading Achievement | | | 17 | | | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 |

*Data based on two academic year programs four and eight months in length.

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 3

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement (Vocabulary Meaning) | Sept.'66 | A | 103 | 9.4 | | 97 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | June '67 | B | 103 | 19.3 | | 45 | 53 | 5 | 0 |

*Data based on one academic year program nine months in length.

# TABLE 7A
# STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

## Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 3

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement | | | 41 | 28.1 | | 24 | 14 | 2 | 1 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement | | | 39 | 28.3 | | 25 | 10 | 3 | 1 |

*Data based on two academic year programs four and six months in length and two summer programs.

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 2

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm: 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement Primary Battery Reading | | | 57 | 16.3 | | 55 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement Primary Battery Reading | | | 56 | 23.0 | | 38 | 12 | 5 | 1 |

*Data based on two academic year programs four and five months in length and two summer programs.

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 4

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm<br>25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Gates Reading Survey | | | 202 | | | 89 | 96 | 17 | 0 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Gates Reading Survey | | | 202 | | | 86 | 73 | 23 | 5 |

*Data based on one academic year program five months in length and four summer programs.

6

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 4

| | | | | | | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Test and Each Subsection | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| | | | | | PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | | A | 322 | 12.3 | | 251 | 59 | 12 | 0 |
| | Month & Year Administered | | | | POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | | B | 322 | 21.2 | | 96 | 190 | 34 | 2 |

*Data based on one academic year program (300 students) and one summer program (22 students)

1

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 5

| | | | | | | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Gates Reading Survey | | | 69 | | | 37 | 25 | 7 | 0 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Gates Reading Survey | | | 69 | | | 31 | 28 | 10 | 0 |

*Data based on two academic year programs three and six months in length and three summer programs

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 5

| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | | A or B | 137 | 19.3 | | 53 | 72 | 10 | 2 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | | A or B | 137 | 24.9 | | 13 | 71 | 51 | 2 |

*Data based on oneacademic year program nine months in length and one summer program.

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 6

| | | | | | | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | Sept.66 | A | 162 | 28.6 | | 14 | 68 | 62 | 18 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement | June'67 | B | 162 | 35.7 | | 2 | 27 | 96 | 37 |

Data based on one academic year program nine months in length.

### TABLE 7A
### STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 6

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gates Reading Survey |  |  | 75 |  |  | 43 | 29 | 2 | 1 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gates Reading Survey |  |  | 75 |  |  | 39 | 27 | 7 | 2 |

*Data based on three academic year programs 3,4 and 6 months in length and three summer programs.

## TABLE 7A
## STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

### Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 7

| | | | | | | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement | Sept.'66 | LM | 56 | 55.0 | | 34 | 18 | 3 | 1 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement | June '67 | KM | 56 | 65.7 | | 18 | 17 | 15 | 6 |

*Data based on one community

# TABLE 7A
# STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

Groups Taking Pre and Post-Tests

Grade 8

| | | | | | | Number of Students Scoring, According to National Norm | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Test and Each Sub-section | Month & Year Administered * | Form | Number of Students | Raw Score Mean | Raw Score Std. Deviation(if possible) | 25th percentile and below | 26th to 50th percentile | 51st to 75th percentile | 76th percentile and above |
| PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement | Sept.'66 | LM | 29 | 69.9 | | 13 | 13 | 3 | 0 |
| POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS | | | | | | | | | |
| | Month & Year Administered | | | | | | | | |
| Stanford Achievement | June '67 | KM | 29 | 76.7 | | 3 | 12 | 9 | 5 |

*Data based on one communtiy

## INSTRUCTIONS

1. Report data on only [illegible] tests.
2. [illegible]
3. [illegible]

TABLE 4

## GRADUATES FROM TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS
## CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM

| | 1963-1964 | | | 1964-1965 | | | 1965-1966 | | | 1966-1967 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools | Title I Schools | | All Other Public Schools |
| | All | 1/3 or More Participants 1/ | | All | 1/3 or More Participants 1/ | | All | 1/3 or More Participants 1/ | | All | 1/3 or More Participants 1/ | |
| Total Number of Graduates | 1255 | | 2562 | 1439 | | 3254 | 1260 | | 3157 | 3067 | | 5381 |
| Number of Schools | 5 | | 11 | 5 | | 12 | 7 | | 14 | 14 | | 25 |
| Mean Size Of Graduating Class | 251 | | 233 | 288 | | 271 | 180 | | 226 | 186 | | 149 |
| Number Of Graduates Continuing Education 2/ | INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE | | | INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE | | | | | | 1553 | | 3058 |

1/ Those schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

2/ A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, Vocational, Commercial or Technical Institute, or Nursing School.

# PART III

# EXEMPLARY PROJECTS

## EXEMPLARY PROJECTS

In this section, selected exemplary projects implemented in Rhode Island during the 1966-67 school year or during the summer of 1967 are briefly described. The selected projects are but a few of the ninety-six projects implemented in the State that could be considered exemplary.

### PROJECT G.I.R.D.

emplary eature : This comprehensive, diversified project implemented by the Providence School Department had four components which provided a continuing sequential program in Special Education for the most educationally deprived special class pupils in the city. These four phase (components) were guidance, instruction, recreation, and diagnosis. Within the G.I.R.D. program were cultural enrichment, industrial arts, physical education, and teacher aide activities. As an integral part of the program, thirty-nine special education teachers who were engaged in the G.I.R.D. project participated in a training program held at a local college. Courses were in the area of management and behavior and reading diagnosis.

tudents: One hundred forty-seven public school children and three non-public school children participated.

Grade Level: Ungraded

Cost: $94,500. total; Approximately $630 per child.

Time: From June 1, 1967 to August 31, 1967; Approximately 150 hours per student.

jectives: To improve the children's verbal functioning; to improve children's non-verbal functioning; to improve the children's self-image; to change in a positive direction their attitudes toward school and education; to reduce the rate and severity of discipline problems; and to improve the children's emotional stability and/or that of their families.

Staffing: Eighty-seven professional and non-professional personnel composed the project staff. Staff involved in "Project G.I.R.D." included the following: Five Elementary teachers; fifteen secondary teachers; eighteen teachers of the mentally retarded; one teacher of the visually handicapped; three teachers of the seriously emotionally disturbed; thirty teacher aides; three guidance counselors; three supervisors; three consultants; one attendance officer; one nurse; and four non-professionals.

The diagnostic team of the Meeting Street School consisted of two pediatric-neurologists, one psychiatrist, two psychologists, two occupational therapists, two social workers, one speech/hearing/language therapist, one physical therapist, and one diagnostic teacher.

rocedures: Twelve classes were established at four designated community schools. Each class was designed to meet a specific handicapping category; trainable, educable-primary, intermediate, and secondary; neurollogically impaired; visually handicapped; multiply handicapped and socially maladjusted. The teacher-pupil ratio in each class was limited to fifteen to one.

Thirty children were referred to the diagnostic team of the Meeting Street School by the G.I.R.D. program for diagnostic evaluations. This team spent a total of nineteen full-time days in completing the evaluations. The psychiatrist acting as a liasion between the project and diagnostic agency conferred and consulted with the total personnel involved in the total project.

**Program: Content**

Instruction was centered around the abilities, interests, and motivations of the children. Where a child found an interest, there were written and audio-visual materials available in the area he selected. The instruction phase was coordinated with the recreational phase so that each child was able to physically work out frustrations, aggressions, and hostilities in a non-restrictive manner.

The guidance facet of the program took place while the children were on field trips. The most effective phase of the G.I.R.D. program as well as the most successful was the diagnoses of thirty children socially, educationally, and neurologically during a six week period. This team approach used by the project G.I.R.D. staff and the diagnostic team of the Meeting Street School could surely serve as a model for other communities.

**Evaluation:**

At the conclusion of the G.I.R.D. program, teachers, teacher aides, and counselors examined and rated the project's objectives for the pupils. Through the use of this instrument, gains made by the children were apparent in self-concept and self-confidence. The youngsters were also rated individually by the counselors on a behavior continuum. Consensus of the evaluators was that the program seems to have been effective in changing the children's behavior as it related to motivation, attendance, disciplinary problems, and continuance in school.

The diagnostic and educational evaluations carried on by the Meeting Street School diagnostic team for thirty children, and through these findings, the placement of these children in special classes attribute to the effectiveness of the program.

## PROJECT GRASP

emplary &: novative ature This remedial program conducted by the Pawtucket School Department provided opportunities for individualized instruction in reading, mathematics, and language. An integral part of the project activities was the establishment of an elementary school guidance program. In addition to the three mobile education centers, a mobile instructional resource lab was operated to provide audio-visual materials and equipment immediately on an "as needed basis." Establishment of a follow-up program to former GRASP children in the form of individual after-school tutoring and counseling was also a distinguishing feature of the program.

Students: One hundred eighty-five public school children and seventy-six non-public school children participated.

ade Level: Grades four through seven

Time: From September 7, 1966 to June 16, 1967; approximately forty-two weeks or 210 hours per child.

Cost: $166,295 total; approximately $637 per child ctives: To enable the educationally deprived youth to read and do arithmetic at a level which more nearly parallels his ability; to help educationally disadvantaged youth to build a better self-image; to assist him in his voactional planning; to give parents, teachers, and students some intensive casework; to help create an acceptable educational climate through counseling; to stimulate and motivate the students involved in the project; to change their attitudes toward school and education; to improve the emotional stability of the students involved in the project by providing a guidance team and an educational specialist who will work to help students improve their reading and arithmetic skills.

taffing: The staff consisted ot three reading-arithmetic specialists one assigned to each Travelab; three elementary school guidance counselors; three social workers, ten teacher aides; one audio-visual coordinator; three part-time university or college consultants; one project director; and one secretary.

Specialized services of a Speech Therapist; a resource lab technician; a psychologist; and opthomologist as well as other health personnel participated in the project.

cedures: A team of a reading-arithmetic specialist, a guidance counselor, a social worker and three aides operated at each project site. Each child after spending an hour in the mobile education center was provided with another hour of correlated follow-up activity in the school reading center. When a child reached grade level or above in reading, he would return to his regular classroom situation. Inclusion of other curriculum materials in the areas of science and social studies helped to stimulate the children's interest at all grade levels. Class size was limited to fifteen children. The guidance team of a counselor and a social worker observed the children daily in the lab-school situation situation. Social workers made daily-weekly visits to the homes and kept careful checks on each child in the project. As a result of their activities, the guidance team established a close rapport with parents, children, the principal of each school, and the classroom teachers.

uation:

Pre- and post-achievement test results of the project children indicated an improvement in reading skills. In some cases, an improvement of three to four years was noted. Scores also indicated that forty-seven youngsters improved beyond a two year level. Evaluation of the project provided direction for specific modifications designed to enhance the learning opportunities of educationally deprived children.

## SUMMER KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

emplary:
eature

This selected example of a preschool program which was conducted by the Johnston Public Schools was designed to provide cultural and educational experiences to disadvantaged children. The screening procedures developed by the staff to determine the needs of the pupils, the development of a team approach to instruction, and the involvement of parents-as-partners in the educational process were the outstanding features of this program.

**Students:** One hundred fifty-two five- and six-year old children participated.

**de Level:** Preschool

**Time:** From June 24, 1967 to August 16, 1967; approximately ninety hours per child.

**Cost:** $26,960 total; approximately $177 per child.

**jectives:** To open wide avenues of learning to the children in the project areas so that they might through their first school experiences: (1) initiate a growing desire to be active, eager participants in the school setting; (2) develop the basic communicative skills; and (3) explore and experiment in their social, physical, and natural environment to gain the understandings and appreciations necessary for happy well-adjusted living; to open opportunities to all adult personnel engaged in the program for personal and professional growth through a sequence of planned in-service experiences so that each member of the team might grow increasingly more able to serve these children.

**Staffing:** Thirty-seven professional and non-professional personnel participated in the preschool program. Staff involved in the Summer Kindergarten Program included: ten primary grade teachers; eleven teacher aides; one college consultant on early childhood education; one project director, and ten non-professionals.

A team which consisted of one psychologist; one guidance counselor; one nurse, and one physician serviced the psychological, counseling, and health needs of the children.

**rocedures:** Children attended school for half-days in a six week program in which materials and opportunities were provided for them to develop readiness for formal school activities, especially by emphasizing the need for working together.

In addition, the Summer Kindergarten Program brought the children out into the community, and brought the community into the classroom. While all of the children shared the common experience of a visit to the Slater Park Zoo, other visits varied according to the interests and needs of particular groups of children. These included trips to a market, a dairy, the library, the fire station, and a chicken farm. Special visitors included representatives of the Bell Telephone Company, fireman, policemen, a sculptress, a religious sister, and a musician.

Orientation and evaluation sessions were conducted for the staff and were strengthened and supported by weekly conferences of the professional staff with the consultant and/or the project director. In this meeting of the minds, the staff became unified in the basic essentials, yet diversified through the sharing of their individual creative experiences.

The counselor's responsibility was to supplement the educational process by assisting the staff in evaluating the individual needs of the pupils through the use of tests and counseling techniques.

**Evaluation:** The high percentage of attendance (90.14%) of the 152 children who were enrolled in the project indicated that both the children and their parents recognized the opportunities offered to them by the program and consistently took advantage of them. Teacher checklists which were used in the third and sixth week of the program to measure the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical growth of each child showed that the program was effective in stimulating changes in the children's behavior toward increasing social maturity. During the final week of the program, parents were asked to evaluate the project responding to twenty items in an open-ended questionnaire. These data indicated that a large majority of parents rated the program as very successful in accomplishing its objectives.

## SUMMER LIBRARY PROGRAM

**Exemplary Feature:** This comprehensive program implemented by the Cranston School Department had a variety of activities designed to strengthen the language-arts experiences of children who had experienced failure in one or more school subjects and for some who came from non-English speaking homes. Within this program were music, social studies, science, art, and physical education activities.

**Students:** Two hundred twelve public school children and eighteen non-public school children participated.

**Grade Level:** Grades one through six.

**Cost:** $18,000 total; approximately $78 per child

**Time:** From June 30, 1967 to August 1, 1967; approximately eighty hours per child.

**Objectives:** To provide individual reading guidance for each child; to help the child discover the fun in using books and libraries for entertainment, and through his experiences to help him a life long habit of reading for pleasure; to give the child satisfying experiences in searching for needed information in the school library and to strengthen his skills in locating such information; to enrich his general cultural background through planned experiences of trips, music appreciation, art, and literature; to provide educational trips which would motivate children to consult library resources for information relative to the trip and its program; to provide experiences in science which would also be related to the resources of libraries, so that the child would see the library as an exploratory source in the area of science.

**Staffing:** Seven librarians, ten teachers, four aides, one director, and one clerk composed the project staff.

**Procedures:** The summer program of school library services was conducted in four project area schools. Project activities utilized a multi-media approach emphasizing the use of filmstrips, recordings, story hours, field trips, and reading materials. Supplementary material and field trips were selected for their appeal to the specialized interests and needs of the participating children.

Each school's activity took place in a library and an adjoining learning center. Each center was staffed with a certified librarian, a teacher, and an aide. The children were divided into small groups where academic subject matter was supplemented by library resources and library materials.

**valuation:** Circulation of 3,650 books for home reading and browsing is an indication of one of the strengths of the program. Not only did the students borrow the books, but many also requested to be given copies of the books. Because of this interest, paperback copies were purchased with Title I funds for their distribution to the students.

Subjective evaluation by parents and staff suggested that students became more cooperative and now have an improved attitude toward school.

## LEARNING CENTER PROJECT

**Exemplary Feature:** This learning center program conducted by the South Kingstown School Department was designed to provide cultural and educational experiences to disadvantaged children. The project was implemented in a small rural community, one that did not have a locally financed learning center project.

**Students:** Twenty-two public school children and one non-public school child participated.

**Grade Level:** Grades four and five.

**Cost:** $15,935 total; approximately $693 per child

**Time:** From June 19, 1967 to August 1, 1967; approximately eighty-one hours per child.

**Objectives:** To change in a positive direction the children's attitude toward school and education and to improve classroom performance in reading, and in other skill areas, beyond usual expectations.

**Staffing:** Two elementary teachers, a librarian, library aide, and a project director/teacher participated in the program.

**rocedures:** Cultural enrichment by means of field trips, as well as reading, science, and social studies activities in which the children were able to choose and plan for themselves what they would like to do, changed substantially the children's attitude toward learning.

Instructional activities were centered around the library. Library books and materials were selected to appeal to the interests and aptitudes of the participating children. The library was also the center of the cultural enrichment activities where filmstrips, recordings, and information on field trips were available. The class ratio was one teacher for every six children. Every member of the project staff participated in a five day in-service training program prior to the start of the project activities.

**Evaluation:** Evaluation of the program was mainly subjective and was measured by the response of the staff that "the children wished they could stay at the school and continue with their classes."